



## Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact [support@jstor.org](mailto:support@jstor.org).

2. Unless the term "floating leaves" is used merely to distinguish the larger leaves from the smaller it is a misnomer, for they do not always float. Thousands of these "floating leaves" were seen in 1918 and again in 1919, which by actual measurement, were submerged at varying depths up to twenty inches.

3. Fruiting stems are not limited to shallow water. It produced fruit abundantly at Sandy Lake in 1919 in water of such depth that the combined length of an ordinary oar—6 ft. 6 in.—and my arm with the sleeve rolled up as far as I could get it did not suffice to reach the bottom. In this particular lake for the past two seasons it has fruited most abundantly in water over six feet deep.

As northeastern Ohio abounds in small lakes it is not improbable that other stations for it will be discovered.

Several sheets of herbarium material were prepared from specimens collected at Sandy Lake and will be given to any one who may care to send postage for it.

STATE NORMAL COLLEGE,  
KENT, OHIO.

### SHORTER NOTES

*Carpolithes macrophyllus* a *Philadelphus*.—In TORREYA, 1911, p. 235, I described a fossil fruit from the Miocene of Florissant, giving it the name *Carpolithes macrophyllus*, and leaving its classification uncertain. I now find that it agrees in every particular with *Philadelphus*, except that the sepals are longer than in any living species known to me. It must be called *Philadelphus macrophyllus*, but it very likely belongs to the same species as *P. palaeophilus* Ckl. 1908, based on leaves from the same rocks.—T. D. A. COCKERELL

### REVIEWS

#### Flora of the District of Columbia\*

Washington botanists are to be congratulated upon the publication of this important contribution to the regional botany of eastern North America, containing, as it does, the record of an

\* Hitchcock, A. S. and Standley, P. C. With the assistance of the botanists of Washington, Flora of the District of Columbia and Vicinity. Contribution U. S. Nat. Herb. 21: pp. 1-329, pl. 42. 1919.

immense amount of original observation by many students over many years. There is a brief introduction, describing the geographic, geologic, and ecologic aspects of the area, which is in a general way a circle of fifteen miles radius with the Capitol as the center and which has yielded 1,630 species of native and naturalized plants here formally listed, with records of habitat, distribution, and common names. Numerous other species, found adventive or as waifs are mentioned in notes and there are occasional critical comments on relationship, morphology, uses and other features.

The Catalogue is preceded by a key to the families based mainly on vegetative characters and by another key to the families based mainly on floral characters, these two keys occupying 30 pages of the book, and they have been very ingeniously worked up; there is a generic key for each family and a species key for each genus. The families have not been grouped in orders, which is to be regretted. As a rule, the keys are detailed and complete enough to effect the determination of species, assuming a general knowledge of the flora by the student using the work. Varieties or races are very sparingly admitted and the recognition of species is commendably sane. Thus only seven species of *Crataegus* are listed, only 6 *Rubi*, only 3 *Laciniarias*, and only 6 *Antennarias*, with an apology for one of them. *Oenothera biennis* is very properly disposed of as "an extremely variable species . . . considered to consist of numerous 'elementary species.'" Generic ranks are for the most part liberally recognized, perhaps not in all families consistently, this doubtless referable to the very considerable number of collaborators (twenty-two). It would be most unfortunate to have anything like that number of students of the same turn of mind; thus *Padus* is not separated from *Prunus*, while *Persicaria* is kept out of *Polygonum*.

A few generic names replace those in ordinary usage, as *Bilderdykia* for *Tiniaria* and *Campe* for *Barbarea*, having priority of publication. Several specific names are likewise strangers, due to bibliographic research and the more correct application of names to type-specimens, noteworthy those ferreted out by

Dr. Blake in his studies of Linnaean species while in London a few years ago. One of these I have supposed might be based on some ancient error or mixture; that is the application of the name *Eleocharis capitata* to what we have long been calling *Eleocharis tenuis*; it seems incredible that Linnaeus could have meant to describe the spikelet of that sedge as subglobose and to have assigned the name *capitata* to it. Linnaeus reached some results which seem queer to us, like his classifying *Lysimachia terrestris* as a Mistletoe and *Comptonia peregrina* as a *Liquidambar*, but these flukes are brilliant as compared with calling the spikelet of *Eleocharis tenuis* subglobose.

It goes without saying that the nomenclature of the District Flora follows the American Code, rather than the so-called International Code forced down the throats of the Vienna Botanical Congress by a German majority and further manipulated by the same majority at the Brussels Congress; we can well understand why the French have never recognized it as valid, and why anybody but Germans or Austrians should so regard it has always been a puzzle, especially as the American Code is much more logical and cuts out autocracy. Internationalism is proving a dangerous principle to play with, and in many aspects has much to condemn it.

The Washington botanists have followed the American Code consistently in almost every item except the use of duplicate binomials; they do not say why these have not been used; zoölogists have used them for many years without losing sleep, and *Sassafras Sassafras* runs well with *Corvus Corvus*. We must, I suppose, conclude that our colleagues of the fifteen-mile circle around the national Capitol, or most of them, simply do not like to say *Catalpa Catalpa*, although by refusing such diction they lose the valuable suggestion that Linnaeus named the tree *Bignonia Catalpa*. Or may it be that they are influenced by the line of thought advanced by Engler at the Vienna Congress when we asked him why he objected and he told us principally that such names had made some of his students laugh! And so the risibility of juvenile Huns prevented their adoption at that highly amusing convocation.

N. L. BRITTON.